



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/539,054 | 06/15/2005 | Hiroshi Yokoyama | 1806.1007 | 4255 |
| 21171 | 7590 | 02/26/2009 | | |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| SUITE 700 | | | HEINCER, LIAM J | |
| 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. | | | | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1796 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/26/2009 | PAPER |
| | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/539,054 | YOKOYAMA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Liam J. Heincer | 1796 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Liam J. Heincer. (3) Tamoka Yoda.

(2) Mark Henry. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner clarified that the citations in the final rejection for Kato et al. were to the English equivalent listed in the first action. The applicant proposed an amendment requiring a metl process. The Examiner further clarified the rationale behind the combination of Kato et al. and Scardino et al..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|---|---|
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03) | /Mark Eashoo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 |
|---|---|